105			(0)
APR 7 8 2003 H	TRANSMITTAL LETTER (General - Patent Pending)		Docket No. DI-5782
In Re Application Of Elizabettini et al.			
S TO A DENVOY		•	
Serial No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Group Art Unit
10/044,234	January 11, 2002	F. Choi	1616
Title:	_		
BICARBONATE-BASED SOLUTIONS FOR DIALYSIS THERAPIES			
	TO THE ASSISTANT COM	IMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:	RECEIVED
Transmitted herewith is:			APR 3 0 2003
Response to Office Action (2 pages) and Return Receipt Postcard			TECH CENTER 1600/2900
•			
¥			
in the above identified application.			
No additional fee is required.			
<ul> <li>□ A check in the amount of is attached.</li> <li>☑ The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. 02-1818</li> </ul>			
☐ Charge the amount of			
, ⊠ Credit any overpayment. ☑ Charge any additional fee required.			
		•	
Dated: April 22, 2003			`
Robert M. Barrett (30,142)			
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS Bell, Boyd & Lloyd LLC			document and fee is being deposited
P.O. Box 1135		on /4/22/2003	with the U.S. Postal Service as

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

first class mail uniter 37 C.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed to the Assistant Commissioned for Patents, Washington, D.C.

Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence

Robert J. Buccieri

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

## APR 2 8 2003IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFIC

Applicants: ¿Elizabettini et al.

Appla Houron

10/044,234

Conf. No.:

8974

Filed:

January 11, 2002

Title:

BICARBONATE-BASED SOLUTIONS FOR DIALYSIS THERAPIES

Art Unit: Examiner:

1616 F. Choi

Docket No.: DI-5782

Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

RECEIVED

APR 3 0 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

## RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

•

1

1

1

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on March 26, 2003.

The Office Action is a restriction requirement. In this regard, Applicants are to choose from six (6) different groups of alleged inventions. The inventions are as follows: Group I (Claims 1-16); Group II (Claims 17-29); Group III (Claims 30-43); Group IV (Claims 44-54); Group V (Claims 53-63); and Group VI (Claims 64-72).

Applicants elect Group I (Claims 1-16) with traverse. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement is not proper. The restriction requirement merely appears to be groupings of inventions by the Patent Office. In this regard, the Patent Office has not engaged in the proper restriction requirement analysis.

MPEP § 803 states when a restriction is proper. Specifically, in relevant part, § 803 states:

If the search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims that are independent to distinct inventions.

The sole analysis the Patent Office has engaged in is whether or not the inventions are distinct from each other. The Patent Office has not stated what classes and subclasses the different inventions are classified in. Therefore, how does the Patent Office know that examination of the different inventions will create any burden, let alone serious burden? The Patent Office has failed to demonstrate that examination of all the groups together would create any undue burden. Accordingly, the restriction requirement is not proper.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be withdrawn or that the proper analysis be set forth.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

Robert M. Barrett Reg. No. 30,142 P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4204

Dated: April 22, 2003\_